



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,226	12/12/2001	Daniel R. McClure	McClure-2	1120
7590 05/09/2005			EXAMINER	
Daniel R. McClure			WONG, ALLEN C	
3310 Cranmore Chase Marietta, GA 30066			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	<u> </u>
		•	DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Astron	10/021,226	MCCLURE, DANIEL R.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Allen Wong	2613
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RETHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stany reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thin briod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AE	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	9 <u>December</u> 2004.	•
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allocation accordance with the practice und	· ·	-
Disposition of Claims		·
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the col 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar prection is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		•
Number (S) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Discrete (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413)

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/9/04 with respect to claims 1 and 15 have been read and considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala (6,304,173) in view of DeLine (US 2002/0075159 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Pala discloses a rear-view display system for vehicle comprising:

a camera disposed near a rear of the vehicle, the camera being generally rearward facing (fig.1, element 50);

a display in the general form of a rear-view mirror, the display being disposed near a top center portion of a windshield of the vehicle, the display being configured to display a video image acquired by the camera (col.2, ln.57-62, note rear camera 50 obtains distant view 54 that gathers image data similar to rear-view mirror, and that display 24 is near a top center portion of a windshield);

at least one position sensor coupled to the display (col.4, ln.43-45; Pala discloses element 92 is a positioning circuitry 92 or position sensor that is interactively coupled to the display 24); and

a servo system coupled to the camera, the servo system being configured to control the direction of the camera based upon information obtained from the at least one position sensor (col.4, ln.43-50, Pala discloses that in fig.2, there is a servo system that is configured to control camera 50 depending on information from positioning circuitry 92 to instruct the motor 52 to move camera 50 to the proper direction, where elements 52, 92 function interactively with element 84 to provide a clear display of the image data, obtained by camera 50, at element 24).

Pala does not specifically disclose the limitation of wherein the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the visual image on the display is similar to that which would be seen in a conventional rear view mirror that is moved in the same position. However, DeLine teaches the limitation of wherein the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the visual image on the display is similar to that which would be seen in a conventional rear view mirror that is moved in the same position (paragraph 0091 on pages 11-12, more specifically, middle of page 12 of paragraph 0091 in that DeLine discloses the alternative structures can be applied where the video device may be mounted in the assembly 308 above the mirror housing but mechanically attached thereto so the camera field of vision moves in tandem with movement of the mirror housing, thus, the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the displayed image is viewed in a similar manner as it would have been in a

conventional rear view mirror moved in the same position). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Pala and DeLine, as a whole, for providing the driver with a clear line of sight for viewing objects on the road in a precise, accurate manner without obstructions (DeLine's page 2, paragraphs 0009-0010).

Regarding claim 4, Pala discloses a controller configured to generate at least one control signal to control the servo system, thereby control the direction in which the camera points (col.4, In.43-50, Pala discloses that in fig.2, there is a servo system that is configured to control camera 50 depending on information from positioning circuitry 92 to instruct the motor 52 to move camera 50 to the proper direction, where elements 52, 92 function interactively with element 84 to provide a clear display of the image data, obtained by camera 50, at element 24; col.4, In.50-56, Pala discloses the user can use element 78 for controlling the direction of the camera).

Regarding claim 5, Pala discloses the controller is configured to point the camera in a direction that closely parallels the direction of the display, as determined by the at least one position sensor (col.4, In.43-50, Pala discloses that in fig.2, there is a servo system that is configured to control camera 50 depending on information from positioning circuitry 92 to instruct the motor 52 to move camera 50 to the proper direction, where elements 52, 92 function interactively with element 84 to provide a clear display of the image data, obtained by camera 50, at element 24).

Regarding claim 14, Pala discloses the use of a LCD, flat-panel, plasma CRT, or other well known types of displays (col.2, In.13-16).

Application/Control Number: 10/021,226

Art Unit: 2613

Regarding claim 15, Pala discloses a rear-view display system for a vehicle comprising:

a camera disposed near a rear of the vehicle, the camera being generally rearward facing (fig.1, element 50); and

a display in the general form of a rear-view mirror, the display being disposed near a top center portion of a windshield of the vehicle, the display being configured to display an image acquired by the camera (col.2, ln.57-62, note rear camera 50 obtains distant view 54 that gathers image data similar to rear-view mirror, and that display 24 is near a top center portion of a windshield).

Pala does not specifically disclose the limitation of wherein the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the visual image on the display is similar to that which would be seen in a conventional rear view mirror that is moved in the same position. However, DeLine teaches the limitation of wherein the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the visual image on the display is similar to that which would be seen in a conventional rear view mirror that is moved in the same position (paragraph 0091 on pages 11-12, more specifically, middle of page 12 of paragraph 0091 in that DeLine discloses the alternative structures can be applied where the video device may be mounted in the assembly 308 above the mirror housing but mechanically attached thereto so the camera field of vision moves in tandem with movement of the mirror housing, thus, the direction of the camera is controllably moved so that the displayed image is viewed in a similar manner as it would have been in a conventional rear view mirror moved in the same position). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Pala and DeLine, as a whole, for providing the driver with a clear line of sight for viewing objects on the road in a precise, accurate manner without obstructions (DeLine's page 2, paragraphs 0009-0010).

Regarding claim 16, Pala discloses further including:

at least one position sensor coupled to the display (col.4, In.43-45; Pala discloses element 92 is a positioning circuitry 92 or position sensor that is interactively coupled to the display 24); and

a servo system coupled to the camera, the servo system being configured to control the direction of the camera based upon information obtained from the at least one position sensor (col.4, ln.43-50, Pala discloses that in fig.2, there is a servo system that is configured to control camera 50 depending on information from positioning circuitry 92 to instruct the motor 52 to move camera 50 to the proper direction, where elements 52, 92 function interactively with element 84 to provide a clear display of the image data, obtained by camera 50, at element 24).

Regarding claim 17, Pala discloses the rear-view display system is used in a vehicle (see fig.1, note Pala uses the rear-view display system in a car, van, sport utility vehicle, or any other vehicle).

2. Claims 2-3 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala (6,304,173) and DeLine (US 2002/0075159 A1) in view of Masunaga (5,838,368).

Regarding claims 2-3, Pala and DeLine do not specifically disclose the servo system comprising two motors. However, Masunaga teaches the use of a servo system that comprises two motors, wherein one motor controls the horizontal direction of the camera, and another motor controls the vertical direction of the camera (see fig.11 and col.21, ln.10-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Pala, DeLine and Masunaga, as a whole, for facilitating the use of adjusting the camera to point in the desired direction when obtaining image data in a quick, efficient manner (Masunaga col.7, ln.52-61).

Regarding claims 6-9, Pala and DeLine do not specifically disclose the use of a zoom lens. However, Masunaga teaches the use of a zoom lens (fig.11, element 402 and col.21, ln.16-19 where zoom operation device 418 permits the zoom in or out of the acquired image data; col.19, ln.11-12, note the zooming operations have two options in that "+" and "-" represents the increasing and decreasing the zooming magnitude). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Pala, DeLine and Masunaga, as a whole, for facilitating the use of adjusting the camera to zoom on the desired image data to obtain a clearer view by utilizing in a quick, efficient manner (Masunaga col.7, ln.52-61).

3. Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pala (6,304,173) and DeLine (US 2002/0075159 A1) in view of Cooper (5,016,098).

Regarding claims 10-13, Pala and DeLine do not specifically disclose the fluid ejection mechanism configured to remove debris from the camera. However, Cooper teaches the use of a fluid ejection mechanism or fluid jet to remove debris from the

camera (col.5, In.1-9, Cooper discloses that fluid can be ejected to prevent the camera head from fogging or remove debris from camera lens by ejecting liquid, ie. water, to clean the camera lens, so clearly, Cooper must disclose the fluid storage area or fluid resevoir to send the fluid to the fluid jet or ejection nozzle for fluid ejection). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Pala, DeLine and Cooper, as a whole, for permitting the ejection of fluids to clean the camera by removing debris so as to obtain a clear, proper view of the image data obtained by the camera in order to properly assess the situation of the task at hand (Cooper col.1, In.63-67).

Page 8

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-7341. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 8am-6pm Flextime.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Allen Wong Primary Examine

Art Unit 2613

AW 5/5/05